



**U.S. Department of Justice**

*United States Attorney  
Southern District of New York*

*The Jacob K. Javits Federal Building  
26 Federal Plaza, 37th Floor  
New York, New York 10278*

February 18, 2025

**BY ECF AND EMAIL**

The Honorable Alvin K. Hellerstein  
United States District Judge  
Southern District of New York  
500 Pearl Street  
New York, New York 10007

**Re: *United States v. Charlie Javice and Olivier Amar*, 23 Cr. 251 (AKH)**

Dear Judge Hellerstein:

The Government respectfully writes with respect to comments made by defendant Charlie Javice's counsel to the media on the eve of trial. In an article published yesterday—the day before jury selection begins today—Javice's lead trial counsel made the following statements to the Financial Times:

Do a Google search and focus on the July 2021 timeframe and I think you'll find about two dozen articles of all kinds about Frank and Charlie talking about her signed-up users in the several hundred of thousands. It was out there in public.

Ex A. This statement was improper and in violation of S.D.N.Y. Local Criminal Rule 23.1 (Free Press-Fair Trial Directives).<sup>1</sup> Counsel for defendant Olivier Amar properly did not comment to the Financial Times.

Counsel for Javice's comments improperly invite potential jurors to conduct their own inquiry into factual matters well beyond the scope of admissible evidence. Defense counsel even instructs potential jurors as to how exactly they should do so ("Do a Google search"). Defense counsel's comments also suggest that JPMC was negligent in failing to uncover the true number

---

<sup>1</sup> The Rule provides that "[d]uring a jury trial of any criminal matter, including the period of selection of the jury, no lawyer or law firm associated with the prosecution or defense shall give or authorize any extrajudicial statement or interview relating to the trial, the parties, or issues in the trial that a reasonable person would expect to be disseminated by means of public communication if there is a substantial likelihood that the dissemination will interfere with a fair trial; but the lawyer or the law firm may quote from or refer without comment to public records of the court in the case."

